

10 April 1991

Security, Democracy, and RAND

Noam Chomsky

1. How many people with clearances have read anything of Noam Chomsky?
2. - What would be the effect on this thinking?
John Linn?

NC assumes: I know all this; there would be no news. Is this not quite wrong? (Post)
i.e., an error of NC!

3. What would be this critique of NC; this "oneness"?
- other than: "his implicit assumption that we already 'know' all this, is wrong; he is all off about our awareness, our state of mind."

4. Is not NC's writing, ^{in effect, "as if,"} "subject to a special clearance, ^{classification} which they don't have?"
(and of whose existence they are not aware!)
a "confidential ^{classification} clearance,"
a secret clearance/class.

5. How is this effect achieved?

(e.g.: by excluding NC entirely from "unclassified" publications those people do read: e.g. the NYT, Post, TV evening news, Atlantic, New Yorker)

6. Thus, the "national security community" is defined, constructed, informed, of what they do not read - "are not permitted to read" - as well as of what they do read.

April 10, 91

2.

5. The RAND Dream: I'm back — but my feelings toward secrecy, and of past oaths, remain a problem; and I am about to confront my past colleagues, at least some of whom disapprove harshly...

7. What do I feel about people who do sign the secrecy oath — "after PP"?

8. ... or, who do abuse the secrecy oath, and consider it binding, after they know what secrecy conceals?

9. Are they not traitors to democracy? Do they not betray the Court, and their oaths (if any) to uphold it? As they betray their oaths (if this occurs) to tell the truth to Congress, or a court?

Are they not party to a ("monstrous") conspiracy?

10. So — what do I think the secrecy system should be?

How should it operate, be constituted?

11. What should be subject to an obligation to tell, to reveal? (MHH)

12. Analysis: Why I could not be accepted back into RAND, DOD, State, WH — nor could I accept.

— or expose, reveal

13. Note failure of journalists to challenge the system, the secrecy & lies; the failure to confront or challenge officials with the question: "Why do you think 'What right have/had you to lie, to conceal, and this? Who/what led you to think you had a right?"

How do you propose to pay, to compensate, make amends, for this concealment, these lies? Do you not feel guilt, shame? (You should...!) "What punishment, "degradation," civil damages, is appropriate? (e.g. banishment from public office!)

as if
journalists
were subject
to the
system!
accepted
it!

14. I did not reveal such matters; nor SI...;
 or "negotiations; footnotes";
 but if I had... what?

(note of attitude on Progression;
 vs. Nat. Huntress of ed.)

15. Reveal/effort: extent of reveling agents
 among journalists (in the past, future:
 as, among my jurors;
 i.e. if have been "trusted,"
 misled about law,
 regard oath & septa as legitimate
 account
 essential
 among Congressmen?

What is attitude of (Big) businessmen on (gov.) reveling?
 (to the businessmen: important?)

16. Note interest in gossip: in penetrating private reveling,
 "construction of private reveling."

Now look on Henry Reagan (interrelation of
 private and public).

17. CII story: can be presented as "alternative
 interpretations," hypothesis, "as consistent with
 known facts and notions as standard interpretations";

18. Also, "what we don't really 'know'"; what should
 be regarded as "unsolving mysteries" of CII.

+ Present

19. My Surprise Party: a benevolent conspiracy; if I
 had suspected it, it would have been "positive paranoia"
 wrong,
 a benign Fait Accompli.

(cf. Powell: "We've brought lots of tools to the party; we're going to
 use them all.")

massive
 torture session

consider of
reveling is
 so effective,
 plausible,
 essential,
generous,
 difficult.

20. Supreme Being: Wf are his real concerns so benign in this case, and so pleasantly efficient?

As with Santa Claus, Santa being, tooth fairy?

Child's sense: benevolent universal

anything is possible

Hollywood: happy ending?

"Were you really surprised?"

Hard to believe; desire for reassurance?

Desire to believe it, desire for it

21. On Jan 17-18- on filing That "everyone" in Congress and public now supported the war:

as if they were all playing a different game from what you understood you were playing — they knew the rules, you thought you did but were evidently wrong ...

you were, apparently, heading for the wrong goal post ...

22. Seeing system: presents an adversarial contest, in which Pros/Expe is unequivocally the Captain/Coach, not an adversary (see, Catch-22...)